

REMARKS

Independent Claim 1 is amended to better point out the subject matter of the present invention by reciting that the ribs of the first wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web of the first wall component both in the direction of the extension of the web and in a direction other than the direction of said extension of the web.

Independent Claim 7 is amended to better point out the subject matter of the present invention by reciting that the ribs of the first wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web of the first wall component both in the direction of said extension of the web of the first wall component and in a direction other than the direction of said extension of the web of the first wall component, and that the ribs of the second wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web of the second wall component both in the direction of the extension of the web of the second wall component and in a direction other than the direction of said extension of the web of the second wall component.

Support for the amendment of Claims 1 and 7 is provided by the Drawing.

The Summary of the Invention portion of the Specification is amended to be consistent with the scope of amended independent claims 1 and 7.

The Detailed Description portion of the Specification is amended in paragraphs beginning on pages 4-6, 8 and 9 to be consistent with the scope of amended independent claims 1 and 7.

New Matter Objection and Rejection

The prior amendment made to page 10 between lines 20 and 21 is deleted.

Claims 31 and 32 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

The rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 14-15 and 25-27 under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Schafer is respectively traversed for at least the following reasons:

Schafer neither discloses nor suggests a ribbed component in which the ribs of the first wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web, as required by both of independent Claims 1 and 7.

It is submitted that the detent barbs 23 disposed upon the distal portion of some of Schafer's ribs are not portions of such ribs, but are merely supported by such ribs, whereby it is not reasonable to interpret Claims 1 and 7 so broadly as to be anticipated by Schafer.

The foregoing argument was made in the Amendment filed August 14, 2009, but was not responded to by the Examiner. Instead, the Examiner merely repeated this rejection from the Office Action of May 14, 2009 and stated that the foregoing argument was moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

The rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 12, 15 and 25-26 under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Burling is respectively traversed for at least the following reasons:

Burling neither discloses nor suggests a ribbed component in which the ribs of the first wall component are thicker than the thickness of the web, as required by both of independent Claims 1 and 7.

It is submitted that the triangular-shaped protrusions 32 disposed upon the distal portion of Burling's ribs 17 are not portions of the ribs 17, but are merely supported by the ribs 17, whereby it is not reasonable to interpret Claims 1 and 7 so broadly as to be anticipated by Burling.

The foregoing argument was made in the Amendment filed August 14, 2009, but was not responded to by the Examiner. Instead, the Examiner merely repeated this rejection from the Office Action of May 14, 2009 and stated that the foregoing argument was moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

PAGE 19
RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 02 2010

To the extent that the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 7 and 9 under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Edwards is applicable to the amended claims presented herein, said rejection is respectively traversed for at least the following reason:

In Edwards' product, the ribs of a given wall component are not thicker than the web of said wall component in any direction other than the direction of the extension of the web between the ribs, as required by both of amended independent Claims 1 and 7.

Conclusion

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner provide a reasoned response to each of any of the foregoing arguments with which he disagrees, wherein the Examiner provides a specific detailed explanation for any disagreement.

Applicants do not necessarily agree with any of the Examiner's comments regarding the applicability of the cited references to any of the claims. However, in view of the reasons presented herein for traversing the rejections of the claims, applicants are not presenting additional arguments at this time. Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments for traversing the present and any future rejections of the claims. Applicants also reserve the right to once again present the cancelled claims for examination in this application and/or in a divisional or continuation of this application.

Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12, 14-15 and 25-27 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

Edward W. Callan
Edward W. Callan
Attorney Registration No. 24,720
Attorney for Applicants

Telephone No. 858-259-5533